



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,023	03/11/2004	Hui Lei	00280770AA	4635
30743	7590	05/17/2006	EXAMINER	
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C. 11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD SUITE 340 RESTON, VA 20190			TARAE, CATHERINE MICHELLE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/797,023

Applicant(s)

LEI ET AL.

Examiner

C. Michelle Tarae

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The following is a Non-Final Office Action in response to the communication received on March 11, 2004. Claims 1-12 are now pending in this application.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parasnis et al. (U.S. 6,334,146).

As per claim 1, Parasnis et al. discloses a system for pervasive enablement of business processes, comprising:

a workflow engine that executes a business process model (col. 12, lines 28-42; col. 14, lines 51-63; The system uses workflow engines across the global collaboration workspace, where the workflow engines execute workflows to accomplish some task. Workflows may be automated as well as user driven.);

a context service that allows context-aware applications to obtain user context information (col. 14, lines 32-50; Workflows may be role-based, in which generic or template workflows are put into a specific role or context such as a specific partner instance.);

an interaction controller that receives specification of individual staff activities from the workflow engine, and upon receiving a staff activity specification, obtains context information of a partner instance from the context service to determine an appropriate collaboration modality for the partner instance, and forwards the engine responses from human partners back to the workflow engine, thereby handling individual interactions with human participants (col. 13, lines 54-67; Workflows may be parameterized over groups of partners that are collaborating together. The workflow engine receives workflow definitions and requests for specific activities from the collaborators and provides the desired collaboration activity such as a multicast.); and

one or more modality adapters that encapsulate details of communicating with a specific collaboration modality (col. 15, lines 10-29; Different modality adaptors, or forms of communication, are used by the global collaboration manager.).

As per claim 2, Parasnis et al. discloses the system in Claim 1, wherein the context service provides dynamic context information about human participants (col. 14, lines 32-50; Workflow roles may be mapped to individual human participants based on the participants' context in the collaboration.).

As per claim 3, Parasnis et al. discloses the system in Claim 2, wherein said dynamic context information includes a human participants' location, activity, connectivity and preferences (col. 8, lines 44-62; col. 20, lines 37-40; Table 2 in col. 10; The system takes into account the relationships among the partners involved in the collaboration and models the way in which they collaborate accordingly. For example, different partners have different technology and security requirements.).

As per claim 4, Parasnis et al. discloses the system of Claim 2, wherein the context service supports both synchronous query and asynchronous callback context functions (col. 5, lines 11-16; Communications across the collaboration network may be synchronous or asynchronous.).

As per claim 5, Parasnis et al. discloses the system of Claim 1, further comprising an address book that maps individual IDs to modality-specific addresses, the interaction controller accessing the address book to look up a modality-specific address (col. 19, lines 46-67; Figures 19 and 20; Each participant in the collaboration workspace has a memory slot associated with an identification number in which the participant receives messages.).

As per claim 6, Parasnis et al. discloses the system of Claim 1, wherein the modality adapters include the adapters for instant messaging, email, e-meeting, discussion threads, phones, pagers, and other communication devices (col. 13, line 67; col. 15, lines 18-26; The system employs various forms of communication such as email and multicasting.).

Claims 7-12 recite substantially similar subject matter as claims 1-6 above. Therefore, claims 7-12 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1-6 above.

### ***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Pizano et al. (U.S. 6,105,055) discusses a system for asynchronous multimedia communication; and
- Notani et al. (U.S. 7,039,597) discusses a system and method for managing collaboration between enterprises.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Michelle Tarae (formerly, C. Michelle Colon) whose telephone number is 571-272-6727. The examiner can normally be reached Monday – Friday from 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz, can be reached at 571-272-6729.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



C. Michelle Tarae  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3623

May 13, 2006